

Supreme Court, U.S.

FILED

No. \_\_\_\_\_

15-373 SEC 20 2/5

In The  
**Supreme Court of the United States**

—♦—  
MARINE FORESTS SOCIETY and  
RODOLPHE STREICHENBERGER,

*Petitioners,*

v.

CALIFORNIA COASTAL COMMISSION,

*Respondent.*

—♦—  
**On Petition For A Writ Of Certiorari  
To The California Supreme Court**

—♦—  
**PETITION FOR WRIT OF CERTIORARI**

RONALD A. ZUMBRUN  
*Counsel of Record for Petitioners*  
THE ZUMBRUN LAW FIRM  
3800 Watt Avenue, Suite 101  
Sacramento, California 95821  
Telephone: (916) 486-5900  
Facsimile: (916) 486-5959

**QUESTION PRESENTED**

May a state supreme court suddenly and arbitrarily change state law, unpredictable in terms of relevant precedents, so as to allow the state to defeat the constitutional protection against taking property without payment of just compensation and without due process of law or has a federal issue arisen making the exercise of this Court's review power necessary?

## PARTIES TO THE PROCEEDINGS

The parties to the proceedings are the petitioners Marine Forests Society and its founder and president Rodolphe Streichenberger (Marine Forests) and the respondent California Coastal Commission (Coastal Commission or Commission).

Petitioner Marine Forests is a nonprofit organization whose purpose is to conduct experimental research on creating new or replacing lost marine habitat. The organization's objective is to discover economically viable techniques that facilitate the creation of large-scale marine forests where seaweed and shellfish can grow on sandy ocean bottoms and attract fish. App. A at 6.

The California Coastal Commission is a California state agency created by the California Coastal Act of 1976 (Coastal Act or Act). The Act is a very lengthy and comprehensive statutory scheme aimed at protecting the coastal zone. The Commission is the entity charged with the primary responsibility for the implementation of the provisions of the Coastal Act. App. A at 12.

## **CORPORATE DISCLOSURE STATEMENT**

Petitioner Marine Forests Society is a nonprofit corporation. As a nonprofit corporation, the Marine Forests Society has no parent corporation or stock owned by any publicly held company.

## TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page
QUESTION PRESENTED .....	i
PARTIES TO THE PROCEEDINGS .....	ii
CORPORATE DISCLOSURE STATEMENT .....	iii
TABLE OF AUTHORITIES.....	vii
OPINIONS BELOW .....	1
JURISDICTION.....	1
CONSTITUTIONAL PROVISIONS AND STATUTE AT ISSUE .....	1
STATEMENT OF THE CASE .....	3
A. Procedural Background .....	3
B. Factual Background .....	7
REASONS FOR GRANTING THE PETITION .....	10
I. THE CALIFORNIA SUPREME COURT HAS SO FAR DEPARTED FROM THE ACCEPTED AND USUAL COURSE OF JUDICIAL PROCEED- INGS THAT THE EXERCISE OF THIS COURT'S REVIEW POWER IS NECESSARY.....	10
II. THE DE FACTO OFFICER DOCTRINE DOES NOT APPLY TO MARINE FORESTS' SEPARATION OF POWERS ACTION .....	14
III. THERE IS NO FEDERAL OR STATE PRECEDENT FOR THE CALIFORNIA SU- PREME COURT'S RULING .....	15
IV. THE CALIFORNIA SUPREME COURT'S SEPARATION OF POWERS CLAUSE RUL- INGS DO NOT APPLY TO THE MARINE FORESTS SOCIETY .....	16

## TABLE OF CONTENTS – Continued

	Page
A. The Separate Proceeding Requirement Is Not Applicable .....	16
B. The De Facto Officer Doctrine Only Applies to Otherwise Lawful Actions .....	18
C. While Injunctions Are Normally Prospective, the Prior Law Still Controls Former Unlawful Acts Under Marine Forests' Facts .....	21
D. The California Coastal Act Provides No Safeguards to Protect Against the Intrusion of the Legislative Branch of Government .....	23
<b>CONCLUSION .....</b>	<b>24</b>
<b>APPENDIX</b>	
App. A: California Supreme Court decision filed June 23, 2005 .....	App. 1
App. B: California Court of Appeal's decision filed December 30, 2002 .....	App. 87
App. C: Order Modifying Opinion and Denying Rehearing; No Change in Judgment filed January 23, 2003 .....	App. 115
App. D: Undisputed Stipulated Facts for Summary Adjudication on First Cause of Action filed February 15, 2001 .....	App. 118
App. E: California Supreme Court Order Granting Review and Expanding the Issues filed April 9, 2003 .....	App. 131
App. F: Certificate of Recognition .....	App. 133

**TABLE OF CONTENTS – Continued**

	Page
App. G: Order Regarding Stay of Proceedings filed May 17, 2001 in Sacramento County Superior Court, Action No. 00AS03293 (including May 8, 2001 Trial Court Deci- sion in Sacramento County Superior Court action No. 00AS00567 attached as Exhibit 1) .....	App. 134

## TABLE OF AUTHORITIES

	Page
<b>CASES</b>	
<i>Bonelli Cattle Company v. State of Arizona</i> , 414 U.S. 313, 94 S. Ct. 517 (1973) .....	10
<i>Bouie v. City of Columbia</i> , 378 U.S. 347, 84 S. Ct. 1697 (1964) .....	12
<i>Brewer-Elliott Oil &amp; Gas Co. v. United States</i> , 260 U.S. 77, 43 S. Ct. 60 (1922) .....	12
<i>Buckley v. Valeo</i> , 424 U.S. 1, 96 S. Ct. 612 (1976) .....	20
<i>Demorest v. City Bank Farmers Trust Co.</i> , 321 U.S. 36, 64 S. Ct. 384 (1944) .....	12
<i>Ex Parte Virginia</i> , 100 U.S. 339, 25 L. Ed. 676 (1879) .....	12
<i>Georgia Railway &amp; Power Co. v. Town of Decatur</i> , 262 U.S. 432, 43 S. Ct. 613 (1923) .....	12
<i>Hughes v. State of Washington</i> , 389 U.S. 290, 88 S. Ct. 438 (1967) .....	10, 13, 14
<i>In re Marriage of Buol</i> , 39 Cal. 3d 751, 705 P.2d 354 (1985) .....	22
<i>Indiana ex rel. Anderson v. Brand</i> , 303 U.S. 95, 58 S. Ct. 443 (1938) .....	12
<i>Lucas v. South Carolina Coastal Council</i> , 505 U.S. 1003, 112 S. Ct. 2886 (1992) .....	12, 13
<i>Marine Forests Society v. California Coastal Commission</i> , 36 Cal. 4th 1, 113 P.3d 1062 (2005) ....	1, 6, 14, 20
<i>Muhlker v. New York &amp; Harlem Railroad</i> , 197 U.S. 544, 25 S. Ct. 522 (1905) .....	12
<i>NAACP v. Alabama ex rel. Patterson</i> , 357 U.S. 449, 78 S. Ct. 1163 (1958) .....	12

## TABLE OF AUTHORITIES – Continued

	Page
<i>NAACP v. Alabama ex rel. Flowers</i> , 377 U.S. 288, 84 S. Ct. 1302 (1964) .....	12
<i>Nebraska Press Association v. Stuart</i> , 427 U.S. 539, 96 S. Ct. 2791 (1976) .....	12
<i>Nollan v. California Coastal Commission</i> , 483 U.S. 825, 107 S. Ct. 3141 (1987).....	19
<i>O'Brien v. Jones</i> , 23 Cal. 4th 40, 999 P.2d 95 (2000) .....	24
<i>Plotkin v. Sajahtera, Inc.</i> , 106 Cal. App. 4th 953, 131 Cal. Rptr. 2d 303 (2003).....	22
<i>Pulliam v. Allen</i> , 466 U.S. 522, 104 S. Ct. 1970 (1984).....	12
<i>Stevens v. City of Cannon Beach</i> , 510 U.S. 1207, 114 S. Ct. 1332 (1994) .....	11
<i>Ward v. Board of County Commissioners of Love County</i> , 253 U.S. 17, 40 S. Ct. 419 (1920).....	12

## CONSTITUTION

U.S. Const. amend. V .....	1
U.S. Const. amend. XIV, § 1 .....	2
Cal. Const. art. III, § 3 .....	2, 4

## STATUTES

28 U.S.C. § 1257 .....	1
Cal. Code Civ. Proc. § 803.....	3, 17

## MISCELLANEOUS

Roderick E. Walston, <i>The Constitution and Property: Due Process, Regulatory Takings, and Judicial Takings</i> , 379 Utah L. Rev. 423-438 (2001) .....	13
--	----

## OPINIONS BELOW

The June 23, 2005 opinion of the California Supreme Court was reported as *Marine Forests Society, et al. v. California Coastal Commission, et al.*, Case No. S113466. The entire opinion appears as Appendix A to this Petition.<sup>1</sup> It is also reported at *Marine Forests Society, et al. v. California Coastal Commission, et al.*, 36 Cal. 4th 1, 113 P.3d 1062 (2005). The opinion issued on December 30, 2002, by the California Court of Appeal, Third Appellate District, was reported as *Marine Forests Society, et al. v. California Coastal Commission, et al.*, Case No. C038753. The entire opinion appears as App. B to this Petition. The court of appeal's entire ruling on rehearing appears as App. C to this Petition. The Sacramento County Superior Court's decision in case number 00AS00567 issued on May 8, 2001, is included as Exhibit 1 to App. G.

---

## JURISDICTION

The California Supreme Court issued its opinion on June 23, 2005. App. A at 1. The jurisdiction of this Court is invoked pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 1257.

---

## CONSTITUTIONAL PROVISIONS AND STATUTE AT ISSUE

The Fifth Amendment to the United States Constitution provides:

---

<sup>1</sup> All further references to appendices hereto are shown as App.

***No person shall be held to answer for a capital, or otherwise infamous crime, unless on a presentment or indictment of a Grand Jury, except in cases arising in the land or naval forces, or in the Militia, when in actual service in time of War or public danger; nor shall any person be subject for the same offense to be twice put in jeopardy of life or limb; nor shall be compelled in any criminal case to be a witness against himself, nor be deprived of life, liberty, or property, without due process of law; nor shall private property be taken for public use, without just compensation.***

(Emphasis added.)

The Fourteenth Amendment, § 1, to the United States Constitution provides:

All persons born or naturalized in the United States, and subject to the jurisdiction thereof, are citizens of the United States and of the State wherein they reside. No State shall make or enforce any law which shall abridge the privileges or immunities of citizens of the United States; ***nor shall any State deprive any person of life, liberty, or property, without due process of law;*** nor deny to any person within its jurisdiction the equal protection of the laws.

(Emphasis added.)

The California Constitution Separation of Powers Clause provides: "The powers of state government are legislative, executive, and judicial. Persons charged with the exercise of one power may not exercise either of the others except as permitted by this Constitution." Cal. Const. art. III, § 3.

In California, a quo warranto proceeding is governed by California Code of Civil Procedure § 803, which provides:

*An action may be brought by the attorney-general, in the name of the people of this state, upon his own information, or upon a complaint of a private party, against any person who usurps, intrudes into, or unlawfully holds or exercises any public office, civil or military, or any franchise, or against any corporation, either de jure or de facto, which usurps, intrudes into, or unlawfully holds or exercises any franchise, within this state. And the attorney-general must bring the action, whenever he has reason to believe that any such office or franchise has been usurped, intruded into, or unlawfully held or exercised by any person, or when he is directed to do so by the governor.*

(Emphasis added.)

---

## STATEMENT OF THE CASE

### A. Procedural Background

The California Coastal Commission is the “state coastal zone planning and management agency” with primary responsibility for implementing the California Coastal Act of 1976. It consists of 12 voting members, 4 appointed by the governor and 8 appointed by the legislature. Prior to 2003, all members served two-year terms at the pleasure of their appointing authorities. The Commission acts by a majority vote of its appointed members. App. B at 88.